







Applicants submit that the combination of Izumi and Evanicky neither discloses nor suggests, singly or in combination, the feature recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 9, of “a parameter adjusting means for, with a variation in a light state of said lighting means as a trigger, adjusting a parameter participating in picture quality so as to conform said light state.” Claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 10 and 14 depend from claim 9. Applicants submit that the combination of Izumi and Evanicky does not result in the invention of claims 2, 6, 10 and 14, and that claims 2, 6, 10 and 14 are patentable over the combination of Izumi and Evanicky for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Thus, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

